Loyola Marymount University
School of Education
Response to Offsite BOE Feedback Report (December 19, 2009)
February 24, 2010

This brief document will serve as a response to the Offsite BOE Feedback Report. It is the hope of the unit that information provided in this response will clarify some of the issues raised by the Offsite Team. The remaining issues will be addressed during the onsite visit.

Standard One

Area of Concern: *Data from key assessments were not available for all programs not reviewed by the state.*

Rationale: Starting on Page 5 of the LMU IR Overview, there appears to be 26 programs that are not reviewed by the state, and data from key assessments for these programs is inconsistently reported throughout the IR and exhibit documents. There are other programs that have data provided throughout Standard 1, but for the majority of programs, either MA only or certificate programs that do not have credentials, there does not appear to be evidence. The unit will need to provide a minimum of two rounds of data from key assessments for each of these at the time of the onsite visit. For those programs with low enrollments, the unit should provide key assessments aligned with program standards for review. (p. 8 – 9)

The revised Tables 2 and 3 are submitted to clarify the academic programs offered by the unit. Please see Appendix 1. The following is a summary of the tables:

Undergraduate Initial Teacher Preparation Programs:
- Elementary Education
- Secondary Education
- Special Education

Graduate Initial Teacher Preparation Programs:
- Elementary Education
- Secondary Education
- Special Education

Graduate Advanced Educator Preparation Programs:
- Literacy: Child and Adolescent Literacy; Reading and Language Arts Specialist; Reading Certificate; At-Risk Literacy
- Professional Clear Teaching Credential: Multiple Subjects; Single Subject; Literacy Education
- English Language Development: Teaching English as a Second Language; Biliteracy, Leadership, and Intercultural Education; Teachers of English Language Certificate (CTEL)
- Catholic School Inclusion
- Special Education Level II Credential: Mild/Moderate

- School Counseling
- School Psychology
- General Education
- Early Childhood Education
- School Administration: Catholic School Administration, Preliminary Administrative Services Credential, Professional Administrative Services Credential
- Doctorate in Educational Leadership for Social Justice

The unit provides a series of key assessments for candidates in the Institute of School Leadership and Administration (ISLA) program; however while it is evident that the program is geared toward school administrators, it is difficult to ascertain which programs fall under the umbrella of the ISLA program, (p. 7)

Programs offered in the Institute for School Leadership and Administration (ISLA) are:
- **Master of Arts:**
    - School Administration
    - Catholic School Administration
- **Credentials**:
    - Preliminary Administrative Services
    - Professional Administrative Services
- **Certificates:**
    - Catholic School Leadership
    - Special Education Leadership
    - Leadership and Equity in English Learner Education
    - Charter School Leadership

The Ed.D. program is not offered under the auspices of ISLA, although qualified candidates may pursue their Professional Administrative Services credential while in the doctoral program.

Area of Concern: Candidate assessment data have not been regularly and systematically collected over the past three years.

Rationale: NCATE requires regular and systematic collection of data for three years at the unit level and a minimum of two rounds of data from key assessments at the program level. (p. 9)

The unit will need to provide two rounds of assessment data for all programs which are offered that are not reviewed by CCTC. Data must also be provided for all off-campus, online, and alternative programs that are not reviewed by CCTC. (p. 2)

Decisions regarding the presentation of data in the IR were based on three sources: 1) *CTC (California Commission on Teacher Credentialing) Program Sponsor Alert* of May 29, 2009; 2) conversations with Donna Gollnick, NCATE Senior Vice President, and Teri Clark, CTC Professional Services Division Administrator, at the NCATE Western Regional Orientation in

August 2009 and; 3) *NCATE Institutional Report (Online IR) Instructions* (updated January 21, 2009).

The *CTC Program Sponsor Alert* of May 29, 2009 states that NCATE confers national recognition to specific approved educator programs. Nationally recognized programs offered at Loyola Marymount University are Multiple Subject Preliminary Teaching Credential; Single Subject Preliminary Teaching Credential in Science, Social Science, and Health; Preliminary Administrative Services Credential. NASP approval of the School Psychology program is considered national recognition.

In conversation with Donna Gollnick and Teri Clark, it was decided that assessment data for unit programs that met all standards in the recent CTC Program Assessment process would not be included in the IR. Unit programs without national recognition that met all standards in the Program Assessment are Multiple Subject and Single Subjects Clear Credentials and School Counseling.

NCATE instructed units to include one year of data in the IR. Although we have additional data, per the instructions, one year of data was referenced in the IR. The additional data will be available as electronic exhibits.

At various points in the Feedback Report, the Off-Site Team noted the low response rate to the unit's follow up surveys.

The School of Education is committed to gathering data to assist us in improving educator preparation programs. We have implemented a two-tiered approach to data collection for follow up surveys. We have contracted with the Center for Teacher Quality (CTQ) and we also survey our program completers and their employers.

CTQ surveys initial teaching credential completers and their employers. The responses are disaggregated by multiple subjects, single subject, and special education programs. The unit's response rate is higher than the response rate of the other participating private universities.

The unit has been concerned by the response rate of our follow-up surveys. In order to increase the response rates and therefore increase the reliability of the information about our programs, we have designed a four faceted approach: 1) increase the quantity and quality of program completer contact information; 2) build our alumni community; 3) rewrite our surveys and; 4) increase the involvement of the Academic Program Directors and Clinical Education staff in the distribution of the instrument. It is our belief that the more that people feel a part of a community, the more likely they are to respond to requests for information. If the information requested is meaningful, easily understood, and easily reported, it is more likely that people will respond. If the invitation to participate comes from a faculty member that the program completers know and respect or a staff member who principals know and respect, it is also more likely that the program completers will respond.

In June 2009, the SOE Assistant Director of Development position was created and filled. One of the responsibilities of this staff member is to build the unit's alumni community. For the past year, she has been reaching out to alumni personally and electronically. We have established an online alumni community, held a networking social in October 2009 (the second is planned for March 2010), and invited program completers to unit sponsored speakers, conferences, and workshops.

In order for outreach to be successful, the unit needs accurate contact information. The Assistant Director of Development has been working with the Registrar, Alumni Affairs, University Relations, and unit faculty and staff to build our alumni database. We have hired temporary personnel to contact alumni to update employment information.

The unit's follow-up survey for program completers and employers needs to be revised. This revision will provide more detailed information focused on unit outcomes designed for program improvement and align to the new reports and assessments required by the CTC. The associate dean and assessment and accreditation manager have been in discussion about the content and format of the redesign. We will use the new instrument with May 2010 program completers who will be surveyed in Spring 2011.

Due to the small number of doctoral graduating classes (three), the small number of graduates (29), the high level of contact we have with the doctoral alumni, and the concentration on program formative assessment, we have not instituted a doctoral follow-up survey. However, with our fourth class graduating in May, it is time to write a follow- up survey. We will send the survey to all doctoral graduates in Spring 2011.

Other than assignments spread throughout the [ISLA] program, there does not appear to be a comprehensive key assessment to assess candidates' ability, including Ed. D. candidates to provide an environment that supports K-12 student learning. (p. 7)

The ISLA culminating portfolio synthesizes the course level assessments into a comprehensive assessment of the candidates' ability to provide a learning environment that supports all students.

The doctoral dissertation serves as the comprehensive key assessment of our doctoral candidates' ability to provide a learning environment in which all students can excel. Titles of recent dissertations include:

- *Surface Equity: A Case Study of Gender Equity and Inequity in Elementary Classrooms*
- *Small School Reform in a Large Urban High School: Does it Make a Difference in Student Outcomes?*
- *Assessing the Voice of At-Risk Students*
- *Catholic School Principal Preparedness in Serving Students with Disabilities*
- *Rethinking the Schoolhouse: A Program Design for Urban District Reform*
- *This is Our Life. We Can't Drive Home: An Analysis of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy as Perceived by Elementary Teachers, Students, and Families in an Urban Charter School*

Participants in the ISLA and the Ed. D. programs appear to be held to the same dispositions standards; however the method of assessment is unclear and will need to be addressed during the onsite visit. (p. 8)

The dispositions of doctoral candidates are assessed at the benchmarks outlined in the Ed.D. Assessment Plan: admission, end of first year of study, proposal defense, and dissertation defense. Additionally, dissertation committee chairs (all full-time faculty) closely monitor dispositions as they supervise, mentor, and guide doctoral candidates.

Assessments of dispositions in the ISLA program are embedded in every course assignment and every capstone assignment. For the unit, dispositions and unit outcomes are the same. Therefore, in the ISLA documentation, the vocabulary used to refer to dispositions is unit outcomes; as the unit dispositions are one in the same as unit outcomes.

Standard Two

Area of Concern: *Data from follow-up studies do not appear to be systematically used to inform program changes and improvements.*

Rationale: *Data are reported from the follow-up survey with no interpretation about what the scores indicate about possible weaknesses of the program and no discussion of how the data are used to make programmatic decisions. (p. 10)*

Data from surveys of employers and program completers are discussed in program meetings and considered in planning for program improvement. Program directors and chairs note the plans and areas of focus for the next year in the program annual reports and department annual reports.

AFI Corrected from Last Visit: *The unit does not systematically aggregate and analyze data to improve candidate performance and program quality.*

Rationale: *LMU is now using LiveText which has enabled it to aggregate and analyze data to improve candidate performance and improve programs; however, since it appears that the implementation of LiveText began during the 2008-09 school year, the unit will need to provide evidence that a pattern for ongoing collection and analyzing of data exists. (p. 10)*

In 2004, the unit adopted LiveText, to assist us in collecting, storing, analyzing, and disseminating data on candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions. In 2005 we piloted LiveText with a handful of teacher preparation faculty and candidates. In 2006, the unit instituted a requirement that all faculty use LiveText. We have been using the system since that time to collect, store, analyze, and disseminate data on candidate performance. The only program not required to use LiveText is the doctoral program.

Standard Three

Area of Concern: *The process for developing the formative/summative assessments of candidates during field placement or student teaching does not appear to be collaborative with school partners.*

Rationale*: The Institutional Report discusses collaboration between University- and school based faculty, but it is not clear that collaboration between the two entities extends to inviting teacher voices to the table for a decision about **new** policy or coursework.*

In 2007, all teacher preparation formative/summative assessment instruments were revised and piloted by Master Teachers, On Site Support Providers, and Supervisors. One result of the process was the development of uniform descriptors for each unit outcome. Master Teachers, University Supervisors, Onsite Support Providers, and Clinical Education collaboratively developed a set of target level candidate classroom behaviors for reference during observations.

In 2008, the Department of Clinical Education made changes to assessment forms in consultation with University Supervisors, Master Teachers, and Onsite Support Providers. The changes were made because only one unit outcome was assessed each semester. Master Teachers, University Supervisors, and On-Site Support Providers believed that they should be observing and evaluating multiple unit outcomes each semester. As a result of the feedback, the department developed new tools for monitoring candidates' clinical performance. Clinical Education will disseminate a survey at the end of this academic year to all partners to solicit feedback on the effectiveness of the changes.

Area of Concern: *The use of feedback on field experiences and clinical practice from the school-based faculty is not clear.*

Rationale*: References are made throughout the IR that the unit seeks feedback from school partners about the quality of program: how prepared candidates are for their field experience; what alternative clinical practice/field experience might be appropriate; should evaluation protocols be changed and if so, how. The ISLA programs systematically solicit program evaluation by including school-based faculty, school administrators, district personnel, university supervisors, and unit faculty in candidates' culminating presentations. It, however, it unclear how programs across the unit **systematically** solicit and then incorporate feedback received into consideration for program changes.*

Feedback from school-based faculty and partners is solicited at the Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education Advisory Board meetings, Intern Advisory meetings, SOE Board of Visitors (unit advisory board) meeting, and the Principals' Breakfast. There is also continual communication between school-based faculty and Clinical Education staff at school site visits and in emails, phone calls, LiveText drop in sessions, orientations, trainings, and professional development activities.

Standard Five

Area of Concern: *The qualifications and responsibilities of term and part-time faculty members may limit their productivity in scholarship and service.*

Rationale: Sixteen of the 42 full-time faculty members are full-time term faculty. For eight of those 16, an MA degree from LMU is the highest degree attained. Only 5 of the 16 seem to be engaged in scholarly work and few seem to be actively involved in professional organizations or in providing education-related services at the local, state, national or international levels. (Exhibit 5d2.1). For 20 of the 60 part-time adjunct instructors the MA from LMU is the highest degree attained.

Term faculty are full-time faculty who are not tenure-line. They have no scholarship/ research or service responsibilities. Some have administrative duties as part of their load. Term faculty are hired for renewable terms. Term faculty are active in the life of the unit, they participate in all meetings and activities of the department and the unit, with the exception of participation in the tenure process.

The unit employs two types of term faculty: visiting faculty and clinical faculty. Most commonly, visiting faculty are hired while the unit is searching for a tenure-line faculty member. Clinical faculty are hired because they have outstanding experience and are experts in their field, in addition to holding the requisite academic qualifications.

Adjunct faculty (part-time faculty) are hired on a term-by-term basis to teach a course. Adjunct faculty only have teaching responsibilities and are hired because of their expert content knowledge, experience in schools, and their ability to teach at the University level. They have no service or scholarship/research responsibilities. Adjunct faculty are expected to attend program faculty meetings and the annual SOE Combined Faculty meeting.

	Tenure-Line	Visiting	Clinical	Adjunct
Teaching	3/3	3/3	4/4	As contracted
Scholarship	Required	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required
Service	Required	Not Required	Not Required	Not Required

Standard Six

There is a question from the Offsite BOE Team about the amount of scholarship and research accomplished by tenure line faculty as it is noted that in addition to teaching six courses, they may have additional duties "to meet administrative needs." (p. 18)

The teaching load for LMU tenure-line faculty is three/three. Tenure-line faculty receive a one class reduction in each of their first two years. In their first two years, tenure line faculty are also exempt from most service responsibilities.

As a professional and graduate school, the SOE organizational structure requires that some faculty assume administrative responsibilities. When faculty undertake administrative responsibilities their teaching loads are adjusted accordingly. In addition to the adjustment of teaching loads, some administrative responsibilities are compensated monetarily. For example, an Academic Program Director of a program with small enrollment receives a one-course reduction per year and receives $3,000 per year. Academic Program Directors of large programs receive a two-course reduction per year and a stipend of $3,000 per year. Department Chairs teach two/two and receive $7,500 per year. These reductions in teaching load allows faculty assuming administrative responsibilities the time to be accomplished scholars and participate in service activities.

AFI Continued from Last Visit: The unit lacks sufficient personnel and data management resources to support the instructional, advising, clinical, and assessment activities necessary to maintain program quality and coherence.

AFI Rationale: Although the IR and materials provided would seem to indicate the AFI has been corrected, it will be necessary for Onsite Team members to meet with candidates and program completers to obtain their perspectives and experiences with adequate support for instruction, advising and clinical experiences. (p. 18)

The unit differentiates between academic advising and professional advising. Academic advising concerns course sequencing, enrollment, credential requirements, navigating the University, and collection of required program documents (e.g. original score reports, Certificates of Clearance, disposition forms, etc.). Course advising ensures that candidates finish their course work in a timely manner and meet all requirements. Professional advising involves faculty serving as mentors, assisting students with networking, and providing advice and counseling regarding the profession of education.

In 2005, the unit moved toward a model of separating the two advising functions to provide more support to the candidates. Each candidate is assigned an academic advisor. To date, the unit has hired two academic advisors, allowing the faculty more time to assist candidates in a professional advising capacity. A third advising support position was approved for the current fiscal year.

Factual Correction: Institutional Report, Standard 3, Table 7, page 8.

Program	Field Experiences	Clinical Practice	Total Hours
School Counseling	100 hours	**600** (~~500~~) hours at 2 of 3 levels (elementary, middle, high school). Minimum 200 hours at 2 levels with 150 hours with 10 pupils from diverse racial/ethnic backgrounds.	**700** (~~600~~) hours

Appendix 1 – NCATE IR Tables 2 and 3 – REVISED

B3. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare candidates for their first license to teach?

Table 2 - REVISED
Initial Teacher Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

Undergraduate Program	Degree / Credential Options	Number of Candidates Enrolled or Admitted	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for National Review	State Approval Status	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE
Elementary Education / Liberal Studies	Bachelor's / Multiple Subjects Preliminary Credential / BCLAD	123	State[*]	No	Approved	National Recognition[**]
Secondary Education / Bilingual Secondary Education	Bachelor's / Single Subject Preliminary Credential / BCLAD	9	State[*]	No	Approved	National Recognition in Science, Social Science, Health[**]
Special Education / Educational Specialist: Mild/Moderate Education	Bachelor's / Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Preliminary Level I Credential	2	State[*]	No	Approved	n/a
Total Undergraduate Candidates	**Fall 2008**	**134**				

[*] *State reviews only the credential portion of the combined programs.*
[**] *National Recognition per California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Program Sponsor Alert Number 09-07, May 29, 2009.*

Graduate Initial Teaching Program	Degree / Credential Options	Number of Candidates Enrolled	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for National Review	State Approval Status	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE
Elementary Education / Bilingual Elementary Education / Literacy and Language Arts	M.A. / Multiple Subjects Preliminary Teaching Credential / BCLAD	254	State[*]	No	Approved	National Recognition[**]
Secondary Education / Bilingual Secondary Education / Literacy and Language Arts	M.A. / Single Subject Preliminary Teaching Credential / BCLAD	288	State[*]	No	Approved	National Recognition Science, Social Science, Health[**]
Special Education	M.A. / Educational Specialist: Mild/ Moderate Preliminary Level I Credential	72	State[*]	No	Approved	n/a
Total Graduate Candidates in Initial Teaching Programs	**Fall 2008**	**614**				

[*] *State reviews only the credential portion of the combined programs.*
[**] *National Recognition per California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Program Sponsor Alert Number 09-07, May 29, 2009.*

B4. What programs are offered at your institution to prepare advanced teacher candidates and other school professionals?

Table 3 - REVISED
Advanced Preparation Programs and Their Review Status

Advanced Program Name	Degree / Credential Options	Number of Candidates Enrolled	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for National Review	State Approval Status	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE
Child and Adolescent Literacy / Reading and Language Arts Specialist Credential / Reading Certificate / At-Risk Literacy Certificate	M.A. / Reading Specialist Credential / Certificate	61	State[*]	No	Approved	n/a
Professional Clear Teaching Credential Multiple Subjects / Single Subject / Literacy Education	M.A. / 2042 Professional Clear Teaching Credential Single Subject Multiple / Subjects	45	State*	No	Approved	n/a
English Language Development: Teaching English as a Second Language; Biliteracy, Leadership, and Intercultural Education; Teachers of English Learners Certificate	M.A. / Certificate	21	State	No	n/a	n/a
Catholic School Inclusion	M.A. / Certificate	29	n/a	No	n/a	n/a
Special Education Credential Level II	Education Specialist: Mild / Moderate Professional Level II Credential	4	State	No	Approved	n/a

Advanced Program Name	Degree / Credential Options	Number of Candidates Enrolled	Agency or Association Reviewing Programs	Program Report Submitted for National Review	State Approval Status	Status of National Recognition of Programs by NCATE
School Counseling	M.A. / Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Counseling	102	State[*]	No	Approved	n/a
School Psychology	M.A. / Pupil Personnel Services Credential in School Psychology	45	State[*]/ NASP	Yes	Approved	National Recognition
General Education	M.A.	17	n/a	No	n/a	n/a
Early Childhood Education	M.A.	17	n/a	No	n/a	n/a
School Administration / Catholic School Administration /	Certificate/ M.A. / Preliminary Administrative Services Credential	103	State[*]	No	Approved	National Recognition[**]
Leadership in Social Justice	Ed. D. / Professional Administrative Services Credential	53	State[*]	No	Approved	n/a
Total Graduate Candidates in Advanced Programs	**Fall 2008**	**497**				

[*] *State reviews only the credential portion of combined programs.*
[**] *National Recognition per California Commission on Teacher Credentialing Program Sponsor Alert Number 09-07, May 29, 2009.*

Total Undergraduate Candidates: 134
Total Graduate Candidates: 1,111
Total Candidates: 1,245